

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 3 and 17 are amended. These amendments are made to enable the claim language to more clearly recite and define the claimed invention, do not add prohibited new matter and are fully supported by the specification. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in the outstanding Office Action are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks (together with the amendments and remarks filed on June 25, 2007).

In the Office Action dated August 24, 2007, the Examiner asserts that the previous Office Action response does not remove the term “standard” from the claims or justify that this term does not render the claims indefinite. In response, Applicants assert that the term “standard” is clearly described in the specification. Furthermore, the term “standard product” is used in the claims in contradistinction to the term “special product.” Using the terms “special product” and “standard product,” the claims describe the different means by which the claimed system manages the processing of these two types of product. Thus, without the term “standard” in the element “standard product,” the claims may not read as clearly. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the term “standard” does not render the claims indefinite, and request withdrawal of the rejection. If the Examiner does not agree with Applicants’ position, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ representatives to suggest and discuss amendments that would be acceptable to the Examiner.

The Examiner has asserted that the term “type” was re-entered in the claims. Without agreeing with or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants note that the claims have been

amended, paying particular attention to the concerns raised by the Examiner, in an effort to advance prosecution. Specifically, Applicants have amended claim 3 to remove the last recitation of the term “special type product;” the claim now reads “special product.”

Applicants note that another use of the term “type” (e.g., “a product facility memory storing *types* and amount of products”) remains in the claims. However, this use of the term “type” is not descriptive or adjectival (as opposed to use of the term “type” in the phrase “special *type* product”), and the meaning of this use of the term “type” is clear from the claims. Accordingly, for these reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Lastly, the Examiner asserts that Applicants have not addressed the inconsistencies in the use of the term “facility.” In the previous Office Action, the Examiner noted that the claims recited “a product facility,” “selecting a facility,” and “the product facility.” The Examiner asserted that there should be more than one facility in line 7 of claim 3, and line 10 of claim 3 should read “the selected facility.” Pursuant to the Examiner’s suggestions, claim 3 has been amended to recite:

an information management system connected to said terminal system and product facilities that can provide various products including the ordered product, to communicate therewith, the information management system receiving the purchase order of the product from the terminal system, selecting a product facility that can provide the ordered product, and transmitting to the selected product facility instructions for providing the selected product, the information management system comprising a design management system that manages design data on products

The Examiner also asserted that it was unclear how the term “product” is used (i.e., whether a “special product facility” or only “standard product facilities” be selected). The “product facility” or “selected product facility” refers to “a product facility that can provide the

P20962.A15

ordered product,” as recited in the claims. Thus, if the product is a “special product,” then the term “product facility” refers to the a product facility that can provide a “special product;” and, similarly, if the product is a “standard product,” then the term “product facility” refers to the a product facility that can provide a “standard product.” Accordingly, Applicants submit that the term “facility” is clearly described in the claims and the specification (particularly as amended), and request withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the Examiner's action and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested and are believed to be appropriate.

The undersigned hereby authorizes the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to charge any fees necessary to maintain the pendency of the above-identified application, including any basic filing fees, application size fees, search fees, examination fees, extension of time fees, and claim fees, to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this amendment, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

September 24, 2007
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191

Respectfully submitted,
Toshio TAMURA et al.



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

William Pieprz
Reg. No. 33,630

